

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	International Journal of TROPICAL DISEASE & Health
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJTDH_115025
Title of the Manuscript:	KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF EYE CARE WORKERS TOWARDS ELECTRONIC MEDICAL RECORDS IN A TERTIARY EYE FACILITY
Type of the Article	Original

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. **Importance for the Scientific Community:** The manuscript is indeed important for the scientific community, especially for healthcare professionals, policymakers, and researchers focusing on health informatics in developing countries. It addresses a critical area of healthcare delivery — the adoption and attitude towards Electronic Medical Records (EMR) among eye care workers in a tertiary facility in Nigeria. Given the global push towards digitalization in healthcare and the unique challenges faced by developing countries in this transition, the study provides valuable insights that can inform strategies to improve EMR implementation and acceptance. 2. **Suitability of the Title:** The title of the article, "Knowledge and Attitude of Eye Care Workers Towards Electronic Medical Records in a Tertiary Eye Facility," is suitable as it accurately reflects the study's scope and focus. However, to make it more informative and to highlight the geographical context, which could be relevant for the study's applicability and interest, an alternative title could be: "Adoption of Electronic Medical Records by Eye Care Workers in a Nigerian Tertiary Facility: A Cross-Sectional Study." 3. **Comprehensiveness of the Abstract:** The abstract provides a succinct overview of the study's background, aim, methods, results, and conclusions. It effectively summarizes the key points, making it comprehensive for readers to understand the study's significance, methodology, findings, and implications without delving into the full manuscript. 4. **Appropriateness of Subsections and Structure:** The manuscript appears to be well-structured with clear subsections, including the Introduction, Methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, and Recommendations. This logical flow allows readers to easily follow the study's process from background and objectives through to findings and implications. However, enriching the Discussion section with broader comparative analysis and deeper exploration of implementation challenges could enhance the manuscript's value. 5. **Scientific Correctness:** Based on the provided summary, the manuscript seems scientifically correct, adhering to established methodologies for conducting and analyzing cross-sectional studies. The use of pretested semi-structured questionnaires and statistical analysis for drawing conclusions is appropriate for the study's aims. 6. **References Sufficient and Recent:** The references seem to cover relevant literature, supporting the study's background and justification. However, to further strengthen the manuscript, including more recent studies or reviews on EMR implementation challenges and successes in similar contexts could be beneficial. References that discuss digital health strategies post-COVID-19, given the pandemic's impact on accelerating digital transformation in healthcare, would also be relevant. Additionally, considering the global nature of EMR adoption, references from other developing countries facing similar challenges could provide a richer context for the study's findings. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Yes</p>	

Review Form 1.7

<p>Optional/Generalcomments</p>	<p>While the manuscript "Knowledge and Attitude of Eye Care Workers Towards Electronic Medical Records in a Tertiary Eye Facility" presents valuable findings on the acceptance of Electronic Medical Records (EMR) in a specific healthcare setting in Nigeria, there are several areas where it could be improved, particularly regarding some limitations and areas not extensively covered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of Comparative Analysis: The paper could benefit from a more thorough comparative analysis with similar studies in other regions or countries. This comparison could provide a deeper understanding of how contextual factors influence EMR adoption rates and attitudes towards it, offering a broader perspective on the challenges and facilitating strategies to overcome them. Limited Discussion on Implementation Challenges: While the manuscript mentions resistance to EMR adoption and acknowledges challenges such as infrastructure gaps, there's a lack of detailed discussion on specific barriers to EMR implementation, such as financial constraints, resistance to change among older staff members, and the need for continuous training. Expanding on these challenges could offer more comprehensive insights into overcoming resistance and facilitating smoother transitions to EMR systems. Methodological Limitations: The study's convenience sampling method and its focus on a single tertiary eye facility limit the generalizability of the findings. The results may not reflect the attitudes and knowledge levels of eye care workers in different settings or regions. Acknowledging these limitations and suggesting ways to address them in future research could enhance the manuscript. Potential for Bias: The reliance on self-reported data without validation may introduce response bias, as participants might provide socially desirable answers or misinterpret questions. The paper does not discuss methods to minimize or address this potential bias. Lack of Depth in the Analysis of Determinants: While the paper identifies associations between demographic characteristics (such as age, professional cadre, and computer literacy) and attitudes towards EMR, it doesn't delve deeply into why these associations exist. A more nuanced analysis could provide valuable insights into targeted interventions to improve EMR adoption rates. Recommendations for Future Research: The conclusion primarily focuses on immediate findings and lacks a robust set of recommendations for future research directions, including longitudinal studies to track changes in attitudes and knowledge over time as EMR systems become more widespread. <p>Addressing these points could strengthen the manuscript by providing a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics at play in EMR adoption and the specific challenges faced in different contexts, thereby enriching the academic and practical contributions of the study.</p>	
--	--	--

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Reviewer Details:

<p>Name:</p>	<p>Vahid Ranaei</p>
<p>Department, University & Country</p>	<p>School of Health, Arak University of Medical Sciences, Iran</p>